

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/088,539	03/19/2002	Veikko Kankaanpaa	540-016.2	6927
4955	7590 03/30/2004		EXAMINER	
WARE FRESSOLA VAN DER SLUYS & ADOLPHSON, LLP BRADFORD GREEN BUILDING 5 755 MAIN STREET, P O BOX 224 MONROE, CT 06468			ALVO, MARC S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1731	
oriitob,	VI 00100		DATE MAILED: 03/30/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	A				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary	10/088,539	KANKAANPAA, VEIKKO				
omee near cummary	Examiner	Art Unit				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	Steve Alvo	1731				
Period for Reply	out of the core, and two	ar the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a re y within the statutory minimum of thirty vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MON [*] . cause the application to become AB.	eply be timely filed y (30) days will be considered timely. THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. & 133)				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	•					
<u> </u>	action is non-final.					
_						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-15 is/are withdrawr 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-7 and 16-20 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of 	have been received. have been received in Apity documents have been received in Apity documents have been received.	pplication No ecceived in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)		4				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Su	mmary (PTO-413)				
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3-19-2002. 	Paper No(s)/	/Mail Date ormal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 1731

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-7 and 16-20, drawn to a method of dispersing pulp.

Group II, claim(s) 8-15, drawn to a dispersing apparatus.

The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: Claim 8 is either obvious over or anticipated by EP 931 584. Accordingly, the special feature linking the two inventions, dispersing device having conical surfaces and a wheel situated at the outlet of the blade opening is obvious or anticipated by EP 931 584. Therefore, restriction is appropriate.

Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Alfred Fressola on March 18, 2004 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-7 and 16-20. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 8-15 withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 1731

Claims 1-7 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 the term "between the conical surfaces" is indefinite as "conical surfaces" does not have an antecedent basis. It is not clear what has a "conical surface". The term "running wheel" is indefinite. Element (7) does not appear to be shaped or function as a wheel. It is not clear how element 7 functions and how it acts as a "wheel".

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 931 584 in view with or without MARKHAM et al (5,733,412) or BERNARD et al (4,865,690).

EP 931 584 teaches a method of dispersing pulp containing solid material and a liquid phase in a dispersing device (Figure 1) wherein the dispersing takes place in a narrow opening (a) between rotating conical surfaces (3,3',3") and (4, 4' 4") on the rotor (2) and stator (1). At the outlet end of the disperser is a wheel (2 and 7) acting as a pump to pump the dispersed material out of the dispersing device. If EP 931 584 does not teach dispersing pulp, especially waste paper, then MARKHAM et al (5,733,412) or BERNARD et al (4,865,690) teach using a dispersing grinder/refiner to disperse waste paper and remove contaminants from the waste paper. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the disperser/grinder/refiner of EP 931 584 to disperse waste paper and remove impurities from the

Art Unit: 1731

waste paper in the manner as MARKHAM et al (5,733,412) or BERNARD et al (4,865,690) teach the use of dispersers to remove contaminants from waste paper. See MARKHAM et al, column 6, lines 17 and 34 for 25% consistency before dilution and 10% consistency after dilution.

Claims 4-7 and 17- 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 931 584 in view with or without MARKHAM et al (5,733,412) or BERNARD et al (4,865,690) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of KURTZ.

KURTZ teaches adding dilution fluid to the periphery of the dispersing device through conduit (31) and other conduits not sahown. It is well known in pulp handling to use dilution water to aid in the pum,ping of the pulp to bring the pulp to a pumpable consistency. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use dilution conduits as taught by KURTZ to bring the pulp to a pumple level in the disperser of EP 931 584 and/or the disperser of MARKHAM et al (5,733,412) or BERNARD et al (4,865,690)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steve Alvo whose telephone number is 571-272-1185. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00 AM to 2:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 571-272-1189. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/088,539

Art Unit: 1731

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (tg/l-free).

Steve Alvo

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1731 Page 5

msa